



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,948	04/30/2001	Tatsuo Itabashi	112857-222	3323
29175	7590	03/18/2005	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			KIM, JUNG W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2132		

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,948	ITABASHI, TATSUO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jung W Kim	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-12,14-20 and 22-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-12,14-20 and 22-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-20 and 22-28 have been examined. Applicant in the amendment filed on December 29, 2004 amended claims 1, 7, 20 and 25, and canceled claims 2, 9, 13 and 21.

Response to Amendment

2. The 112, second paragraph rejection to claim 20 is withdrawn as the amendment overcomes the 112, second paragraph rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 29, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant's response does not comply with the requirements of CFR 1.111(c), because applicant or patent owner does not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. A general allegation that the prior art of record does not define the patentable invention does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, applicant's response does not reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action; applicant was not responsive to the objections to

the specification and claims as well as a 112 rejection outlined in the previous action.
CFR 1.111(b).

5. In Remarks pg. 12, last paragraph-pg. 13, 2nd paragraph, applicant argues
Davis does not disclose transmitting the contents information access requests and terminal identification information, wherein the second information processing unit collates received terminal identification information and pre-registered terminal identification information, and outputs the contents information readout request to the first information processing unit in the event that the received terminal identification information and pre-registered terminal identification information match, as recited in claim 1 and 7, and similarly recited in claims 13, 14, 19, 20 and 25 ... there is no mention of terminal identification information and pre-registered terminal identification information, wherein a collation process allows for the transmittal of content information.
While Walker discloses assigning unique device Ids to devices (col. 4, lines 34-42), there is no teaching suggestion or motivation to combine Walker with Davis. The same argument applies to Claus and Nerlikar as well.
6. It is noted that applicant allegations are based on revised claims 1, 7, 20 and 25, wherein the new limitations are substantially similar to those limitations defined in now canceled claims 2, 9, 13 and 21.
7. Regarding applicant's argument the prior art of record fails to teach the limitations of these claims, examiner respectfully disagrees. First, contrary to applicant's arguments, the aforementioned limitation recited by the applicant is not similarly recited in claims 14 or 19; neither of these claims define transmitting terminal

identification information nor processing the received terminal identification information and pre-registered terminal identification, either verbatim or substantially. Since, the applicant makes no further response to these rejections, applicant does not sufficiently rebut the *prima fascia* case of obviousness. See *in re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("The examiner bears the initial burden, on review of the prior art or on any other ground, of presenting a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. If that burden is met, the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shifts to the applicant. . . After evidence or argument is submitted by the applicant in response, patentability is determined on the totality of the record, by a preponderance of evidence with due consideration to persuasiveness of argument."). Furthermore, the revision to claim 25 constitutes as a new issue and is addressed in arguments below.

8. Second, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 20, the claimed limitations are found to be taught in combination of either Davis and Walker or Davis and Claus. Further, In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation to combine both Davis and Walker, and Davis and Claus were established in the Office action dated September 24, 2004, paragraphs 26 and 33; and in the instant Office action (in summary: terminal identification information uniquely identifies the participants of a transaction for a more secure transaction as taught by both Walker and Claus).

9. Finally, in response to applicant's argument that Davis does not teach the limitation wherein the second information processing unit calls up the communication device (Remarks, pg. 14, 1st full paragraph), examiner disagrees: the flow of communications indicated by Figures 4 and 5 clearly indicate such features.

Claim Objections

10. Claims 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claim refers to a program claimed in claim 24; however, claim 24 claims an information providing method; a program is claimed in claim 25. Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

11. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

12. The following title is suggested: "Information providing system utilizing IC cards and method thereof".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
14. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
15. Claims 23 and 24 both refer to an information providing method as claimed in claim 21; however claim 21 was canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
17. Claims 14, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,282,522 (hereinafter Davis)
18. As per claim 14, Davis discloses an information providing system for performing predetermined processing using a data holding device capable of holding data including personal information for recognizing at least users, and a communication terminal device, the system comprising:

- a. a first information processing unit which, upon receiving transaction start information via a communication network, outputs a verification response confirmation request, performs predetermined processing based on the data of the data holding device upon receiving a response signal sent from the communication terminal device, and holds at least processing data (Davis, figure 4, reference nos. 224 and 226 and related text); and
- b. a second information processing unit which, upon receiving the verification response request, confirms the communication terminal device corresponding to the identification information of the data holding device registered beforehand, calls up the communication terminal device via the communication network, and upon receiving a response signal from the communication terminal device supplies the response signal to the first information processing unit (Davis, figure 5, reference no. 206 and 214, and related text).

The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 14.

19. As per claim 15, Davis discloses a system as outlined above in the claim 14 rejection. In addition, the first information processing unit receives identification information of the data holding device in addition to transaction start information, performs collation of the identification information, and in the event that positive results are obtained from the collation, outputs a certification response confirmation request to the second information processing unit. Davis, figure 7, reference no. 356. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 15.

20. As per claim 18, Davis discloses a system as outlined above in the claim 14 rejection. In addition, the first information processing unit monitors and holds contents information of data of the data holding device, and upon receiving a contents information readout request provides the contents information held in the corresponding data holding device to the requesting party (Davis, figure 7, reference no. 234);
- a. and wherein, upon receiving a contents information access request, the second information processing unit outputs a contents information readout request to the first information processing unit and requests the contents information of the data holding device, and transmits supplied contents information to the communication network (Davis, figure 7, reference nos. 310, 312, 314a and 316a);
 - b. and wherein the communication terminal device further includes at least a display unit, with the contents information access request being transmitted by the communication unit thereof to the second information processing unit via the communication network, the contents information being displayed on the display unit upon the contents information of the data holding device transmitted from the first information processing unit having been received via the communication network (Davis, figure 7 and figure 10, reference nos. 512, 514 and 516).
21. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

23. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Walker et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,828,751 (hereinafter Walker).

24. As per claim 1, Davis discloses an information providing system comprising:

- a. a communication terminal device, wherein the communication terminal device includes a display unit, a communication unit, and a transmitter (Davis, figure 4, reference nos. 204 and 210, and related text);
- b. a data holding device, communicatively coupled to the communication terminal device, wherein the data holding device stores content information and personal information pertaining to a user (Davis, figure 4, reference no. 5);
- c. a first information processing unit for processing and storing contents information, and transmitting the contents information upon receiving a contents information readout request (Davis, figure 4, reference nos. 224 and 226); and
- d. a second information processing unit for receiving contents information access requests sent from the communication terminal device via a communication network and outputting the contents information readout request

to the first information processing unit so as to request supply of contents information of the data holding device, and transmitting the supplied contents information to the communication terminal device (Davis, figure 4, reference nos. 206 and 214-216; figure 5, reference nos. 206 and 214);

e. wherein the communication unit transmits, via the transmitter, the contents information access requests to the second information processing unit, and receives the contents information of the data holding device transmitted from the second information processing unit, such that received contents information is displayed on the display unit (Davis, 12:23-45).

25. Further, the communication terminal device transmits IC card identification information in addition to the contents information access request, and the second information processing unit collates received IC card identification information and pre-registered identification information, and outputs the contents information readout request to the first information processing unit in the event that the received identification information and pre-registered identification information match. Davis, 17:27-51.

26. However, Davis does not expressly teach transmitting and verifying terminal identification information. Walker teaches transmitting and verifying terminal identification information to ensure the identity of the device handling a transaction. Walker, col. 4:38. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit and verify the terminal identification information in the

system of Davis to uniquely secure the terminal device as taught by Walker. Ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 1.

27. As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the system further comprises: a dedicated terminal device for performing exchange of data between the first information processing unit and the data holding device, wherein the first information processing unit performs predetermined processing based on the data holding device data, and updates the data held therein. Davis, col. 12:1-45. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 3.

28. As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the data holding device is an IC card. Davis, col. 10:66-11:47. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 4.

29. As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the communication terminal device is a cellular telephone, and wherein the cellular telephone and the second information processing unit are connected via a cellular telephone communication network. Davis, col. 12:7-11. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 5.

30. As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the communication terminal device is a personal computer communication terminal device,

and wherein the personal computer communication terminal device and the second information processing unit are connected via the internet. Davis, Abstract and col. 12:5. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 6.

31. As per claims 7 and 8, the rejections of claims 1 and 3 are incorporated herein. In addition, the method handles a plurality of data holding devices and data held in the multiple data holding devices are supplied to parties requesting access to the held data, wherein the personal data is processed to at least recognize individual users associated with each data holding device. Davis, col. 6:18-26; figure 4, reference nos. 324, 236 and 235. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 7 and 8.

32. As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated herein. In addition, the supplied contents information is displayed on a predetermined terminal device. Davis, col. 7:11-12. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 10.

33. As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated herein. In addition, the method further comprises the steps of:

- f. performing settlement processing regarding settlement performed by the data holding device (Davis, figure 5, reference nos. 308, 314 and 318); and
- g. updating the contents information of data of the data holding device generated by the settlement processing, and transmitting to the data holding device (Davis, figure 5, reference no. 318).

The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 11.

34. As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated herein. In addition, the updated information is displayed on the communication terminal device. Davis, figure 10, reference nos. 514 and 516. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 12.

35. As per claim 16, it is a claim covered by the teachings outlined in the claim 1 and 14 rejections, and it does not teach or define above the inventions outlined in the claim 1 and 14 rejections. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Walker for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1 and 14.

36. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Nerlikar U.S. Patent No. 5,629,981 (hereinafter Nerliker).

37. As per claim 17, Davis covers a system as outlined above in the claim 14 rejection. Davis does not disclose controlling output response signals based on position information of the communication terminal device. Nerliker teaches verifying a message from a device based on, inter alia, position information of the device, wherein the received position data from the device is compared to the expected position data, and if a match is found then the message is verified. Nerliker, figure 6; col. 9:40-50. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to continue transaction processing when the location of a device is verified to ensure that a

requesting party of a transaction is verified to perform transactions within authorized areas. Nerliker, 2:39-50. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 17.

38. Claims 19, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Claus.

39. As per claims 19 and 20, Davis covers a system as outlined above. Davis does not disclose a second data holding device capable of holding data containing information that identify providers which provide at least products or services. Claus teaches transfer techniques using smart cards where a first data holding device is capable of holding personal information identifying at least users, and a second data holding device is capable of holding data containing information identifying providers which provide at least products or services. Claus, col. 2:44-57. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for data holding devices to be utilized by both at least users and at least providers to ensure the security and identity of both parties of a transaction as taught by Claus. Ibid. Hence, the invention covered by Davis in view of Claus covers the following:

- a. a first data holding device capable of holding data containing personal information identifying at least users (Claus, figure 1, reference nos. 102 and 107);

- b. a second data holding device capable of holding data containing information identifying providers which provide at least products or services (Claus, figure 1, reference nos. 104 and 105);
- c. a communication terminal device capable of performing data exchange between the first and second data holding devices and capable of communicating via a communication network (Claus, figure 1, reference no. 106); and
- d. an information processing unit which performs predetermined collation upon reception of data of the second data holding device transmitted from the communication terminal device, and upon obtaining positive collation results transmits a transaction processing continuation signal to the communication terminal device via the communication network, and then upon receiving the data of the first data holding device performs predetermined processing based on the received data, and holds at least processing data (Davis, figure 4, reference nos. 206, 214-216 and 238; figure 5, reference nos. 312, 314, 324 and 326; col. 14:18-25);
- e. wherein identification information of the first data holding device is transmitted in addition to the data, and in the processing data holding step, collation of the identification information is performed, and in the event that positive collation results are obtained, predetermined processing is performed based on the data of the first data holding device (Davis, figure 5, reference nos. 324 and 326).

The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 19 and 20.

40. As per claim 24, Davis covers a method as outlined above in the claim 20 rejection. In addition, the first and second data holding devices are each IC cards. Claus, figure 5, reference nos. 102 and 104. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 24.

41. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Claus, and further in view of Nerlikar.

42. As per claim 22 and 23, Davis covers a system as outlined above in the claim 20 rejection. Davis does not disclose controlling output response signals based on position information of the communication terminal device. Nerliker teaches verifying a message from a device based on, inter alia, position information of the device, wherein the received position data from the device is compared to the expected position data, and if a match is found then the message is verified. Nerliker, figure 6; col. 9:40-50. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to continue transaction processing when the location of a device is verified to ensure a requesting party of a transaction is verified to perform transactions within authorized areas. Nerliker, 2:39-50. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 22 and 23.

Art Unit: 2132

43. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus U.S. Patent No. 5,461,217 (hereinafter Claus) in view of Walker.

44. As per claim 25, Claus discloses a program for a computer, wherein the computer executes the steps of:

- a. receiving data of a shop data holding device capable of holding data containing information identifying at least providers which provide products or services, transmitted from a communication terminal device (see Claus, Figure 1, Reference Nos. 105, 130, 143 and 151);
- b. receiving data of the shop data holding device and performing predetermined collation thereof, and upon obtaining positive collation results transmitting a transaction processing continuation signal to the communication terminal device (see Claus, Figure 1, Reference Nos. 110, 116, 141 and 145);
- c. receiving data of a user data holding device capable of holding data containing personal information identifying at least users, transmitted from the communication terminal device (see Claus, Figure 1, Reference Nos. 107, 114 and 149); and
- d. upon receiving the data of the user data holding device, performing predetermined processing based on the data, and holding at least processing data (see Claus, Figure 1, Reference Nos. 122 and 126; Figure 2).

45. Claus does not expressly teach transmitting and verifying terminal identification information. Walker teaches transmitting and verifying terminal identification information

to ensure the identity of the device handling a transaction. Walker, col. 4:38. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit and verify the terminal identification information in the system of Davis to uniquely secure the terminal device as taught by Walker. Ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 25.

46. As per claim 26, the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated herein. In addition, in the data reception step, identification information of the user data holding device is received in addition to the data of the user data holding device; and wherein, in the processing data holding, upon performing collation of the identification information and obtaining positive collation results, predetermined processing is performed based on the data of the user data holding device. Claus, figure 1, reference nos. 114, 122 and 126; figure 2. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 26.

47. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus in view of Nerlikar.

48. As per claim 27, Claus discloses a program as outlined above in the claim 25 rejection. Claus does not disclose controlling output response signals based on position information of the communication terminal device. Nerliker teaches verifying a message from a device based on, inter alia, position information of the device, wherein the received position data from the device is compared to the expected position data, and if

a match is found then the message is verified. Nerliker, figure 6; col. 9:40-50. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to continue transaction processing when the location of a device is verified to ensure a requesting party of a transaction is verified to perform transactions within authorized areas. Nerliker, 2:39-50. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 27.

49. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus in view of Davis.

50. As per claim 28, Claus discloses a program as outlined above in the claim 25 rejection. Claus does not disclose the communication terminal device is a cellular phone. Davis teaches a payment system using a smart card wherein the communication terminal device communicating with the smart card in a payment transaction is a cellular phone. Davis, col. 12:7-11. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the communication terminal device to be a cellular phone. Motivation for combination enables users to make secure transactions using the convenience and portability of a mobile phone as known to one of ordinary skill in the art and as taught by Davis. Ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 28.

Conclusion

51. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung W Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jung W Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Jk
March 14, 2005



GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100